



**You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUS
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

Title: Like fruits of the Bible tree : moral status of metropolises

Author: Piotr Skudrzyk

Citation style: Skudrzyk Piotr. (2015). Like fruits of the Bible tree : moral status of metropolises. W: M. S. Szczepański, G. Gawron, B. Lewicka (red.), "Urbanism as a way of life : trying to rediscover" (S. 11-23). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersytet ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Piotr Skudrzyk

Like fruits of the Bible tree Moral status of metropolises

Double-faced nature of civilization

Metropolises are a core of civilization. We may say this is a statement of fact. Civilization means highly developed way of human life: high technology, high level of organisation, high level of knowing nature, high level of expressing human feelings, in other words, a developed culture and art. As has been on many occasions said, this level can be reached by common effort of a great number of people. Civilization means an organisation. Centres of such a big and complicated organisation must be very intensive in their structure and functions. A great number of people and a great number of institutions need to be gathered in a relatively small place. They are metropolises.

We say metropolises are a core of civilization, an essence, flowers or fruits of it, but we do not say metropolises are a heart of civilization. However, we may say they are a heart of civilization bearing in mind they are a big pomp to make goods, technologies, political orders, fashions in architecture, music, painting, clothes and all the other forms of culture up to the ways of eating and life circulate. But we do not mean “heart” in the sense of deep and morally precious emotions. Why? Because we mainly understand civilization as a high technique — a technique in producing goods: material, intellectual and emotional ones. While using the phrase “emotional goods”, I mean feelings experienced by receivers of a huge amount of the forms of professional art accessible on the market. Let us say, the feelings which do not constitute the core of people’s sense of life. The ones that appear with tremendous speech and — as such — disappear setting us free for a moment from harshness of our lives. But

people's sense of life is constituted by the feelings experienced in everyday life during confrontation with real problems and institutions.

In the age of Enlightenment, a "civilization" was understood as a social way of life which is rationally, technologically, institutionally and — morally — higher. Now, civilization is seen as something morally neutral. It is seen as a gigantic process going on by its own logic; a gigantic mill which does not care about an isolated seed. This gigantic process is not concerned with fate of an individual. Because it is gigantic and independent from frail fate of an individual, civilization sometimes shows cynicism being prone to corruption and perversion. This is a frequent theme for intellectuals — to draw bad features of civilisation. We may point out Saint Augustin's example at the close of antiquity or Jean Jacques Rousseau at the beginning of industrial era.

Metropolises have a particularly bad image. For Oswald Spengler metropolises are fruits and expressions of a deathly process of society's aging:

A stone colossus of «metropolis» finishes biography of every great culture. [...] Everybody who will cast a glance from a tower at this sea of houses will find in this fossilized history of a living creature precisely this epoch in which organic growth ends and nonorganic, so unlimited gathering going beyond all horizons begins. [...] In every of these wonderful populous metropolises there exists a terrible poverty, a decline of moral standards which just now produces a new primitive man in mansards and attics. [...] But no poverty, no compulsion, even clear consciousness that this course is mad, nothing can diminish an attractive power of these demonic monsters.

(Kołakowski A. 1981: 243, 245—246)

For Spengler metropolis life is cut off from "the cosmic rhythm". In metropolises we can find entertainment instead of a true joy of life, "a perfumed religious and philosophical cult" instead of "a pure logic of everyday work" (ibid.: 248). For Spengler a human being ought to feel deeply real everyday life. This is a true religion not this speculated one. Civilization with its metropolises which heavily lack spirit is in natural stage of an old age; it is close to its natural death.

Today, we usually do not look at civilization in such a catastrophic way. Michel Foucault — one of the most prominent modern thinkers sensitive to faults and maladies of civilization — defined metropolis as "a seat of paranoia and madness, but also socially desirable behaviours" (Jałowiecki, Szczepański 2002: 9). I try to understand this double-faced attitude toward a metropolis. Great dangerous faults and great power of positive attraction. Why? Why evil is seen as good? Or, rather, the question should be the opposite one: Why good is seen as evil? Looking this way or another, the answer seems the same: it is because a metropolis is great. Every great power, every great capabilities, every great process, even the one aimed at accomplishing good goals, has its side

effects, its inaccuracies; it is prone to lose its right direction. Because civilization is great and powerful, its side effects and inaccuracies are deep, painful and dangerous. It is a dangerous thing to use a powerful tool even if aimed at fulfilling good goal. Such warnings one can find when buying the items like chain saws and the like equipped with a powerful motor: they are dangerous! Such a warning one can find in the *Bible*: “Do not take fruits from the tree of knowledge of good and evil!” Knowledge is dangerous! The biblical order seems strange. Why are we not to try to gain more knowledge? As human beings we feel the opposite: we practically and morally ought to try to know about the world more and more; we ought to develop all sciences. The biblical warning ought to be understood as a warning to be careful during obtaining more knowledge — not as a warning not to get more knowledge at all. The biblical authors broke down under the pressure of danger. Thus, they wrote to us: Do not take these fruits at all! They were only humans. It is true that God speaks to us — as the Christians believe. But, I dare to say, God speaks to us only through human mouth, human psyche and senses which could observe only the natural phenomena. And human psyche is not perfect. One question has been still left: What do we mean by the word “God”?

A metaphysical meaning of universalism

Let us treat knowledge, civilization and metropolises as the media allowing people to reach higher level of existence, taking into account that they [people] use or shape them properly. Let us accept that a higher state of existence is an inevitable task for human beings. This is a metaphysical task. We cannot stay at any even good and quality level. We are forced by human internal and the world external natures — especially the nature of our societies — to go further and higher. Knowledge and civilization must extend to infinity: knowledge must extend and try to grasp the Whole Cosmos; civilization must extend over the whole Earth and unite the human race. In such a context, the “universalism” grows into a problem. Polish famous writer and intellectual Witold Gombrowicz (1904—1969) wrote:

Only universal culture can face up to the world, never local cultures can do this, never these people who live only partial existence. [...] a homeland is only one of manifestations of eternal and universal life.

(Cited after Szczepański 2006: 5)

A metaphysical task to go higher and unite wider is difficult because it is the metaphysical one. The Bible authors warned us inventing a metaphor of the

tree of knowledge of good and evil. Mankind does not obey this warning; all the time it tries to go higher and surely acquires more knowledge. However, it seems that mankind realizes this metaphysical task only as a side effect of limited concrete ends which mainly grasp people's attention. People feel forced at first to take concrete earthly tasks. Not only because of hard demands of the material life but also because of pleasure and charm of the material successes. To many people these successes are enough. Great intellectuals seem to be to teach and lead people toward higher goals. But now, postmodernism dominates in the world of intellectuals. In this world there are dominating an idea of equality of all cultures and an idea of scepticism which states that objective evaluation of cultures is impossible. An idea of higher goals and, specially, an idea of metaphysical goal seem to be *passé*, they are felt as something barren and boring. An idea of metaphysical goal and universalism are even accused of being the tools to dominate others who are not directed rightly. They are accused of being a way to totalitarianism.

Leszek Kołakowski has more balanced attitude towards metaphysics and universalism. He believes in "universality of European tradition", promotes "Eurocentrism" and "superiority of European culture" (Kołakowski 2010: 283, 271, 282). He promotes universalism but "an inconsistent one". Kołakowski pronounces "superiority of European culture" because "it has developed and managed to maintain being unsure of its own norms" (*ibid.*: 282—283). He defines it as follows:

This ability to question itself, skill to throw out its self-confidence creates spiritual power of Europe [...] We confirm our being Europeans by our ability to keep ourselves at a critical distance from ourselves, by ability to see ourselves through eyes of stranger, by that we appreciate tolerance in public life, scepticism in intellectual work, a need to confront all possible reasons as well in a law procedures as in science, speaking shortly, by that we leave open an area of uncertainty.

(*ibid.*: 277, 281)

"To leave an area of uncertainty" and "to be unsure of somebody's own norms" do not only mean "to be uncertain" or "to be unsure". Kołakowski also uses the terms "universalism" and "superiority". European culture is unsure of its own norms because it "suspects" there are the better norms — universal, transcendental, metaphysical ones written somewhere in the air. For Kołakowski this is not only the European culture that "feels" universal norms but this is it which does so in the most advanced way. The universality of European culture does not mean uniformity of all the world. This universality is inconsistent. Culture could interpret universal values in many different and uncertain ways. The way to universal values is broad. We may head them by many specific paths following this way. We do not have to be postmodern to avoid being fundamentalist. And we should be grateful to have Kołakowski.

Universalism versus localism

The higher we are, the more we can see; the more we can grasp or conquer, the more we want. The widest base we have, the highest tower we can built. The widest area on the Earth is the whole Earth as such. Thus, economic, political and cultural elites tend to be global; they tend to be universal. Economical method of building a high tower demands using as minimum cost-consuming material as possible. The most economical structure is a structure of a network. The Eiffel Tower could serve here as a metaphor. The Tower stands thanks to its rivets put in cross-points which are nodes for all construction. They must be strong enough. Manuel Castells describes such function of metropolises:

The new global economy and the emerging informational society have indeed a new spatial form, which develops in a variety of social and geographical contexts: mega-cities. [...] They are the nodes of the global economy, concentrating the directional, productive, and managerial upper functions all over the planet [...] Mega-cities cannot be seen only in terms of their size, but as a function of their gravitational power toward major regions of the world.

(Castells 2000: 434)

We may use our metaphor of the Eiffel Tower. We may imagine Castells' global network society as the gigantic Eiffel Tower based on the whole Earth. All the Tower construction is made from more or less the same material.

A second major trend of cultural distinctiveness of the elites in informational society is to create a lifestyle and to design spatial forms aimed at unifying the symbolic environment of the elite around the world, thus superseding the historical specificity of each local. [...] international hotels whose decoration, from the design of the room to the color of the towels, is similar all over the world to create a sense of familiarity with the inner world, while inducing abstraction from the surrounding world [...].

(ibid.: 447)

This picture is the opposite to Huntington's picture of plurality of civilizations clashing with each other. In Castells' picture there are also different civilizations. They are different tissues located in space inside cells of the network. These different tissues may also clash with each other. But this is getting less and less important comparing to rising power of one homogenous global network.

In their monograph *City and Space in a Sociological Perspective* Bohdan Jałowiecki and Marek Szczepański form the term "metropolitan class". They find ten spheres in which typical features of the metropolitan class could be drawn. Seven of them are the material ones, like, among others, profession, income,

place of living, mobility. Three spheres: educational level, cultural capital and wide social identification are of the cultural character describing the ways of thinking (Jałowicki, Szczepański 2002: 246). I think proportion of these two groups of spheres in authors' table is adequate to proportion in real life. Three to seven is quite good proportion for culture. A moral level of culture is a different matter. Now, in our analyses we observe a surface layer of culture of metropolitan class: its cultural instruments to build its social position and strength. A deeper moral level of this culture will be observed below.

Manuel Castells draws a dramatic picture of rising the network society. Global elites have a huge ability, favourable conditions and attractive perspectives to build economic global network. They climb very high to catch a global view and act in a global space. This space is very distant from earthly space below.

[...] elites are cosmopolitan, people are local. The space of power and wealth is projected throughout the world, while people's life and experience is rooted in places, in their culture, in their history. [...] the logic of global power escapes the socio-political control of historically specific local/national societies.

(Castells 2000: 446)

The sociologist points that "capital is globally coordinated" what makes it enormously powerful; "labor is individualized" what makes it enormously weak (ibid.: 507).

In Castells view this drama is something more than a tension between two different societies: a society of capitalists and a society of workers. It is a tension between two abstract social spaces.

There is not, sociologically and economically, such a thing as a global capitalist class. But there is an integrated, global capital network, whose movements and variable logic ultimately determine economies and influence societies. [...] [Capitalists] are ultimately dependent upon the non-human capitalist logic of an electronically operated, random processing of information. [...] [capitalist classes] prosper as appendixes to a mighty whirlwind which manifests its will by spread points and future options ratings in the global flashes of computer screens. [...] Networks converge toward a meta-network of capital that integrates capitalist interests at the global level [...].

(ibid.: 505—506)

This space Castells names "the global network of capital", or, in other words (and simultaneously), "the space of flows". Those flows are the current flows of information, money, capital and power.

The next space — the one inhabited by workers — is of a different character when compared to the space of capital. Castells calls it "the space of places". Here the geographic localization plays its crucial role. This is so due to the relationships between people; those relationships have grown up through gen-

erations living in that place. On the one hand, localization integrates group as a whole and, on the other hand, it separates one group from another. Thus, "Labor is disaggregated in its performance, fragmented in its organization, diversified in its existence, divided in its collective action". (ibid.: 506)

Tension is great, dramatically great. The global network is enormously strong and like an avalanche it has to be stronger and stronger. Local people are weak and are getting weaker and weaker. However, getting weaker and being left aside sometimes means getting stronger by a sense of injustice, an emotion of anger. Especially, when this concerns a huge number of people.

Mega-cities are the main points of social space that is the global network. But they are special points for this second space of people in historical places, too. Mega-cities are not the nodes of space of historical places. The structure and content of historical places was produced historically in other points and areas and still is maintained by them. Mega-cities suck people into their space providing them only with substantial level but not allowing them to participate in economic global network.

[Mega-cities] are also the depositories of all these segments of the population who fight to survive, as well as of those groups who want to make visible their dereliction, so that they will not die ignored in areas bypassed by communication networks.

(ibid.: 434)

A picture which Castells creates we may re-draw using our metaphor of the Eiffel Tower. The tower can be built extremely high under condition it has been not grounded on the sticky soil of historically and psychologically complicated people's lives. But this undertaking could become a trap. Very high construction free from solid material may rise in a direction that leans from the desired perpendicular. Sooner or later, sloping construction must fall down.

Castells proposes us useful intellectual schemes. He also offers us the flushes of moral spirit pointing out emphatically miserable, often tragic situation of a great majority of mankind. He exposes the mechanism leading the global network to mad, uncontrolled pursuit of wealth. In the prologue to his *opus magnum*, he declares his strong opposition to "fundamental split between abstract, universal instrumentalism, and historically rooted, particularistic identities". He defines this split as the "structural schizophrenia between function and meaning". Castells declares his opposition to postmodern culture which celebrates "the end of reason, giving up on our capacity to understand and make sense" (ibid.: 3—4). According to him, rationality, social action and the liberating power of identity could counterbalance "the end of reason" (ibid.: 4).

However, all of this seems too little to me. His moral standpoint seems to break down under the strain of highly abstract academic phrases and empirical data unable to keep up with theoretical constructs. Such phrases and data act

as nothing more but just building the material for the global academic network which exists for itself far away from the language and emotions of ordinary people rooted in concrete places and concrete life matters. Nevertheless, Castells' morally precious statements rescue the remnants of our hopes in the academic world.

Some warm words about metropolises

Definitely much more warm words about living in metropolises we can find in a book written by Kwame Anthony Appiah (2008). He was born and grown up in Ghana, highly educated in the United Kingdom and now he works in the United States as a professor of philosophy in Princeton University. Appiah has won a position in an academic global network without leaving strong connections with the soil of his background and its spirit of life. It is really a great achievement. Generally, the academic network tower is specially high because it is built from light and cheap material: it is built from paper. It has effective lifts built from words which are fashionable and free from connection with real life. These lifts can take an intellectualist very quickly to the highest position of paper fame. This career is not only an opportunity — it is an obligation: if You are too heavy You hinder growth of a tower or even threaten its stability. But happily, the academic network has enough toleration for different kinds of intellectuals including such as Appiah.

Appiah is aware of dramatic tension between the global society and the local ones. He underlines power of the former and weakness of the latter. However, he puts special emphasis on deep moral essence of human universalism. Growing up of the global society is not only achieving by it a great economic power which itself is a great value. Growing up of the global society is achieving a goal immanent to human nature: a goal of unity of mankind. This goal is deeply written in human psyche. We can see it clearly when an unknown stranger finds himself in a dangerous situation. Then we feel we ought to help him first of all leaving aside our interests and interests of our friends and countrymen. If we forget them for a moment and start thinking based on the rules of pure logic we will understand that “national borders are not essential — they are historical contingencies and accidents” (Appiah 2008: 14). He points to Hitler and Stalin as the preachers of loyalty limited to a nation or a class; the preachers who were strongly expelling the loyalty to mankind as a whole (*ibid.*: 15). The philosopher directs our attention at the most fundamental thought: “Cosmopolitanism has its origin in a simple idea preaching that in the community of mankind as well as in national communities we must develop habits of coexistence”. (*ibid.*: 17)

These habits must create something more than “a neat isolation of communities” (ibid.: 19). Appiah writes about loyalty to mankind in a captivating way: “Cosmopolitanism is an adventure and an ideal [...]” (ibid.: 18). Of course, loyalties to the communities which are closer to us are stronger than loyalties to the more distant communities. However, “[...] there is no conflict between a local loyalty and a universal morality — between being a part of a local place and a part of all mankind”. (ibid.: 17)

Surely, we live in a big amount of communities being emerged one into the bigger another: we live in a close family which is a part of wider family which is a part of a town or a village which is a part of a region and so on. To reconcile loyalties to different communities is not an easy thing; to give up one’s loyalty to a community — whatever defined — is morally and in a long perspective also practically impossible. Although there is no way to avoid conflicts between the loyalties to different communities, there is also possible to build cooperation between them and supporting one another. It is dialectics of all things. An attitude which takes stand that “we must disavow local loyalties in the name of this great abstraction which is mankind” is not the mostly desired version of cosmopolitanism (ibid.: 14).

Globalism and universalism are accused of milling all cultures into a one homogenous pulp. Based on his own experience, Appiah could easily deny this rule. He has found that globalisation, on the contrary, has favoured a blossom of local cultures and even has given birth to new ones. Appiah brings memories from his youth when he lived in regional metropolis Kumasi in Ghana. Coming back to his youth while he lived in the regional metropolis of Kumasi in Ghana, he reminds the Indians, Iranians, Libyans, Chinese, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scots, Germans, Greeks, Hungarians who then lived and worked there. Due to globalisation, living and working there they created diversity of the Kumasi population. However, there are still places that globalisation has not touched yet. Appiah finds them in the villages near Kumasi (ibid.: 17, 125—126).

It is true that many local identities are threatened by rising economic power of the global network and dangerous changes in global prices and capital circulation. Appiah suggestively describes disintegration of village communities near the metropolis of Kumasi. This disintegration was caused by lowering of global prices of cocoa. Many young people decided to leave their villages, families and communities and to go to cities to look for a new job and a new life. Older people sadly watch old life dying. Appiah writes:

We may sympathise with them. But we cannot force their children to stay there in the name of preservation their authentic culture; and we cannot subsidize to infinity thousands of isolated homogenous islands when this is senseless from economic point of view.

(ibid.: 128)

Preserving traditional communities in their previous form seems absurd. According to Appiah, members of these communities cannot and do not want to preserve their poor old way of life having an opportunity to live better thanks to global civilization. Another thing is to preserve their historic oeuvre. "Preserving culture — in a sense of broadly understood cultural artefacts — differs from preserving cultures". (ibid.: 130)

Dying of cultures is a natural phenomenon. History as such is full of the cultures that died once, long ago. This must be taken for granted. Now, many traditional local communities very often reach for new technologies to continue producing traditional products, preserving and presenting some of their habits as an artifice show. In these cases, metropolises partly take role of the patrons, doctors and protectors of local traditional cultures enabling them the new forms of existence. Thus, universalism and globalism are not the opposites to the diversity of cultures. The true cosmopolitanism takes stand that "Because there are so many human possibilities worth to examine we do not expect or wish for that every person or every society ought to approach one way of life". (ibid.: 14)

Tension between the global civilization, universalism, cosmopolitanism on the one hand and the local, historical cultures on the other does not have to be tragically enormous. He points to the essential powers engaging on both sides — to connect and build relationships — instead of separating one from the other. His thought is optimistic in a mature way. And so is his manner of writing: clear, simple, interesting, although concerning serious problems. His writing is like a letter from human to human.

A moral essence of metropolises

Metropolises are the nodes, crucial points and peaks of contemporary civilization becoming more and more global. They are like fruits of the Bible tree: they give their inhabitants knowledge of good and evil. Knowledge means the skills, tools, capital, institutions and, in general, the ability to achieve defined goals. The bigger city, the bigger knowledge. The Bible authors were deadly frightened by enormous dimensions of knowledge of good and evil. We are frightened, too — but in another way. We feel a paralysing fear watching and imaging devil activities born in "civilized" contemporary world: watching terrorists' cruelties, powerful tools of destruction invented by states and their armies to harm or kill, watching destruction of human psyche made by drugs and alcohol, watching immoral and illegal activities growing in legal institutions like banks, corporations, whole states and in illegal mafias and other criminal organisations, watching developing of cybercrime, watching avalanches of mar-

ket victories of expansive mass culture over delicate high culture. A cradle of all of these phenomena are the metropolises. We are frightened. We cannot imagine the evil could be stopped. We have resigned ourselves to our fate: we must live in such a dangerous and spoilt world. We have only a faint, timid hope: we (understood individually, just I and my family and friends) will be lucky, all these devil forces will miss us, we will manage to bypass all these horrors.

But the Bible metaphor has its other side, this better one. Knowledge means also the knowledge of good. The bigger city, the bigger good. We know this, too. It is a reason why we come to metropolises in millions. We come into them hoping to get better job, to live among educated, gentle and colourful people, to make use of wide spectrum of specialized institutions, to visit theatres, fine arts galleries and museums, to listen to music concerts, to live among imposing design and architecture. Shortly speaking: to be as close as possible to the achievements of our civilization. It is also true that while meeting a citizen of the metropolises like New York, London or Hong Kong we usually think: How lucky he must be! We boast with pleasure about our visiting any great metropolis, about working there or even cooperating with any firm from there; for every academic it is an honour to publish in any famous academic publishing house connected with some famous university connected with some global metropolis. The most significant intellectual, civil, human rights, ecologic and artistic movements take their origin, have their centres, lead their activities in metropolises.

We know it all. But we are like the Bible authors. First of all, we see the bad fruits and complain about them. Such an attitude is psychologically comfortable. We can treat all circumstances of our life as something alien, something standing aside. We do not identify our circumstances as really "ours". Thus, we can freely complain about our lives here and their meagre conditions, about people, institutions, towns, metropolises or states. Shortly speaking, we can complain about anything we like. And we could dream about other worlds and other ourselves. Not about improving what we have but about being somewhere else. Instead of working hard on better conditions of our social environment, moving to another one thinking it would be better. But we forget — quite a new social environment does not exist. Emigrating means leaving one's homeland and changing it into somebody else's one — with the same problems. With the same ourselves. There is no way to escape from ourselves. There is no way to escape from Reality.

Our life is our love. An old truth taught to us by religions, arts and everyday life. Love understood as a consequence and an open attitude to positive ingredients of any object of Reality. The nature of Reality can not be homogeneous. Multiplicity is its essence. Every object includes infinity of positive elements. Every object includes infinity of negative ones. No matter if it is the landscape, the living creature, the human, the village, the town, or the metropolis. We should love them all. Without exception to the rule. We should love them as we

can. We should love life as it is. And this really happens. We love (at least it seems so) our parents and our children. We love our partners, dogs, cats, woods, landscapes, minerals, stars at night. Some of us love their job. Others love their governments.

And, what is of special importance in this book, some of us love metropolises. We can hear about such an attitude to New York, London, Berlin, Sankt Petersburg, Bratislava, Warsaw. A regional Silesian magazine is accompanied by a supplement *I love Katowice* (i.e. the capital of Silesia). (Almost) everyone admits: a nice and brave watchword. Surely, the words that need courage to be spoken. Declaring love also means evoking positive emotions despite all the bad and harsh features that the object of our love is full of. Among many others, there is one danger that lover should be aware of. He/she may turn out to be naïve.

Being naïve occurs a bitter and destructive thing. Love must be mature. We rarely succeed in accomplishing this feat in relation to our families and friends. And this is so in relation to towns, metropolises, states and governments.

Love is a delicate phenomenon. It is unexpectedly easy for her to turn into Embarrassment or Hate. Global civilization is also a delicate construction. It is unexpectedly easy for her to turn into a futile chaos of over-complication or barbarity. It can burst into pieces at any moment. In complicated world full of greed, injustice and anger economic breakdown is possible at any moment. Nuclear weapons has been found out long ago. Civilization and Love are similar in structures. They need one another. Civilization is a great task, a great task needs great intellect and, first of all, great positive emotions.

Metropolises are crucial nodes of civilization. And civilization is a crucial form of our life. Thus, metropolises are crucial for our life. Our life always needs love from us. Metropolises also do. To love means to put down somebody's roots very deeply in activity, human or (minor or bigger) town. Deep roots stabilize. Deep roots enable to keep contact with the essence. With that what is deeply inside often hidden by severe and harsh surface. Moral values of metropolises are based on their [metropolises'] deep possibilities. A moral admirer of metropolises must be like a miner: he must be brave, hard, patient, stubborn, resistant to dirty and dangerous situations and, first of all, he must have a strong, clear heart to extract the gold of Life. Our life is our love. Our love is our life.

References

- Appiah K.A. (2008). *Kosmopolityzm. Etyka w świecie obcych* [*Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in the World of Strangers*, 2006]. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
- Castells M. (2000). *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol. 1. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford UK, Malden USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Jałowiecki B., Szczepański M.S. (2002). *Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej* [*Town and Space in a Sociological Perspective*]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Kołąkowski A. (1981). *Spengler*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo „Wiedza Powszechna”.
- Kołąkowski L. (2010). Szukanie barbarzyńcy. Złudzenia uniwersalizmu kulturalnego [Looking for a Barbarian. Illusions of a Cultural Universalism]. In L. Kołąkowski, *Nasza wesola apokalipsa. Wybór najważniejszych esejów* [*Our Merry Apocalypse. A Selection of the Best Essays*]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Szczepański M.S. (2006). *Między domem a kosmosem. Ojczyzny prywatne a system światowy* [*Between Home and Cosmos. Private Homelands and the World System*]. Katowice: Biuro Rektora Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Quotations have been translated by Piotr Skudrzyk.

Jak owoce z biblijnego drzewa Moralny status metropolii

Streszczenie

Autor artykułu rozważa moralną atmosferę wobec metropolii obecną w pracach wybranych intelektualistów. Szkicuje katastrofizm Spenglera, a następnie teorię globalnego społeczeństwa sieci Castellsa. Szczególnie pozytywny materiał znajduje w pracy amerykańskiego filozofa z pochodzenia z Ghany — Kwame Appiaha. Na końcu formułuje własną próbę, w której rozważa moralny status metropolii w najwyższych kategoriach etycznych.

Słowa klucze: cywilizacja, metropolia, moralność, uniwersalizm, lokalność